



# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/436,920	11/09/1999	SHRINIWAS OHIA	062891.0320	7304
75	90 05/31/2002			
BAKER & BOTTS LLP 2001 ROSS AVE DALLAS, TX 752012980			EXAMINER	
			MIRZA, ADNAN M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2152	
			DATE MAILED: 05/31/2002	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		09/436,920	OHIA, SHRINIWAS				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Adnan M Mirza	2152				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication a	appears on the cover sheet with	h the correspondence address				
A SHOTHE I  - Externation - If the - If NO - Failu - Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REIMAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION Insions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. In period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state the period by the Office later than three months after the material patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. t 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a represent the statutory minimum of thirty iod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT atute, cause the application to become ABA	oly be timely filed  (30) days will be considered timely.  HS from the mailing date of this communication.  NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
1) 🖂	Responsive to communication(s) filed on Q	9 November 1999 .	,				
2a)□	·	This action is non-final.					
3)	Since this application is in condition for all closed in accordance with the practice und	owance except for formal matte	• •				
Dispositi	on of Claims		•				
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the applicat	tion.					
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are rejected.						
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and ion Papers	d/or election requirement.					
9) 🗌 🤈	The specification is objected to by the Exam	iner.					
10)[ ]	The drawing(s) filed on <u>09 November 1999</u> is	s/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ obj	jected to by the Examiner.				
	Applicant may not request that any objection to	the drawing(s) be held in abeyar	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
11) 🔲 .	The proposed drawing correction filed on	is: a) approved b) dis	sapproved by the Examiner.				
	If approved, corrected drawings are required in	reply to this Office action.	•				
12) 🗌	The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner.					
Priority (	under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120						
13)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore	eign priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).				
a)	☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:						
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
* 5	3. Copies of the certified copies of the particular application from the International See the attached detailed Office action for a	Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).					
14) 🗌 A	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for dome	estic priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(e) (to a provisional application).				
_	)  The translation of the foreign language Acknowledgment is made of a claim for dom	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •					
Attachmen	it(s)		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,				
2) Notice	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(	5) Notice of In	ummary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)  Iformal Patent Application (PTO-152)				
0.00	rademark Office						

Art Unit: 2152

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claim1,3,5-7,9,10,12,14,16,17 & 19 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horn (U.S. 6,192,414) and in view of Mitchell et al (U.S. 6,230,181).

  As per claim 1 Horn disclosed a system for communicating management information, comprising: a first interface card; a second interface card; and a management card coupled to the first interface card and the second interface card (Fig. 14, col. 9, lines 1-14).

  However Horn failed to disclose the management card operable to establish a communication link between a client and a particular one of the first interface card and the second interface card selected in response to a communication link. In the same field of endeavor Mitchell disclosed the management card operable to establish a communication link between a client and a particular one of the first interface card and the second interface card selected in response to a command

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the management card operable to establish a communication link between a client and a particular one of the first interface card and the second interface card

communicated by the client; and communicate management information using the

communication link (col. 4, lines 1-14).

Art Unit: 2152

selected in response to a command communicated by the clients as taught by Mitchell into the management information system of Horn to make the system more stable and fault tolerant.

- 3. As per claim 3, 9 & 17 Mitchell disclosed wherein: the first interface card is coupled to a first network device that uses a first operating system (col. 3, lines 58-63); the second interface card is coupled to a second network device that uses a second operating system (col. 3, lines 63-67); and the processor is further operable to configure the management information for the operating system of the network device associated with the particular interface card (col.6, lines 66-67 & col.7, lines 1-10).
- 4. As per claim 5 Horn disclosed wherein the command comprises information selecting one of the first interface card and the second interface card (col. 10, lines 10-40).
- 5. As per claim 6 Mitchell disclosed wherein the management information comprises information used to configure a network device associated with the particular interface card (col. 6, lines 66-67 & col. 7, lines 1-10).
- 7. As per claim 7 & 14 Horn disclosed a method for communicating management information performed by a management card, comprising: receiving a command from a client, the command identifying a particular one of a first interface card and a second interface card (col. 9, lines 61-67 & col. 10, lines 1-10); establishing a communication link between the client and the particular interface card in response to receiving the command; and communicating management information using the communication link (col. 10, lines 11-40).
- 8. As per claim 10 Horn taught a method further comprising operating the client to generate the command and the management information (col. 5, lines 22-32).

Art Unit: 2152

- 9. As per claim 12 & 19 Horn taught wherein the command comprises information selecting one of the first interface card and the second interface card (col. 5, lines 22-32).
- 10. As per claim 16 Horn disclosed wherein the processor is further operable to communicate management information using the communication link (col.5, lines 1-15).
- 11. Claim 2, 4,8,11,13,18,15 &20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horn (U.S. 6,192,414), Mitchell et al (U.S. 6,230,181) and in view of Latif et al (U.S. 6,393,483).

As per claim 2 Horn-Mitchell failed to disclose wherein the management card comprises: a switch operable to establish the communication link between the client and one of a first port and a second port; a memory operable to store mapping information associating the first port with the first interface card and the second port with the second interface card; and a processor coupled to the memory and the switch, the processor operable to: receive the command identifying a particular interface card; determine the port associated with the particular interface card using the mapping information; and command the switch to establish the communication link between the client and the determined port. In the same field of endeavor Latif disclosed wherein the management card comprises: a switch operable to establish the communication link between the client and one of a first port and a second port (col. 5, lines 10-20); a memory operable to store mapping information associating the first port with the first interface card and the second port with the second interface card; and a processor coupled to the memory and the switch, the processor operable to: receive the command identifying a particular interface card; determine the port associated with the particular interface card using the mapping information (col. 6, lines 27-

Art Unit: 2152

47); and command the switch to establish the communication link between the client and the determined port (col. 6, lines 52-67).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated processor coupled to the memory and the switch as taught by Latif in the system of Horn-Mitchell to make it more versatile and time consuming.

- 12. As per claim 4, 11 & 18 Latif taught wherein the communication link comprises a serial communication path (col. 5, lines 10-20).
- 13. As per claim 13 & 20 Latif taught wherein the management information comprises information used to configure a network device associated with the particular interface card (col. 3, lines 30-41 & lines 54-67).

#### Conclusion

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Martin et al (U.S. 5,867,706) discloses the name convention of the resources over the network.

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to Adnan Mirza whose telephone number is (703)-305-4633.

Art Unit: 2152

- 16. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday during normal business hours.
- 17. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Rinehart can be reached on (703)-305-4815. The fax for this group is (703)-746-7239.
- 18. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

(703)-746-7239 (For Status Inquiries, Informal or Draft Communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT");

(703)-746-7239 (For Official Communications Intended for entry, please mark "EXPEDITED PROCEDURE"),

(703)-746-7238 (For After Final Communications).

19. Any Inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)-305-3900.

Any response to a final action should be mailed to:

## **BOX AF**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks Washington, D.C.20231

## Or faxed to:

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to 4<sup>th</sup> Floor Receptionist, Crystal Park II, 2021 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA 22202.

Art Unit: 2152

Adnan Mirza

Examiner

Art Unit 2152

MEHMET B. GECKIL PRIMARY EXAMINER

Mehnt Guld